

**REMARKS****I. Status of the Application**

Claims 20-40 are pending in this application. In the September 11, 2007 office action, the Examiner:

- A. Rejected claims 39 and 40 as being indefinite;
- B. Rejected claims 20, 23, 28, 29 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the background of US Pub 2003/0026269 to Paryani, in view of US Pub 2004/0202125 to Sakamoto et al.
- C. Rejected claims 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Paryani;
- D. Rejected claim 21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paryani in view of US Pub 2003/0103487 to Kim et al.;
- E. Rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paryani in view of Sakamoto in further view of US Pub 2004/0165576 to Reunamaki;
- F. Objected to claims 22, 26-27, 30 and 38 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; and
- G. Objected to the title for not being descriptive.

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 22, 26, 27, 30 and 38 is gratefully acknowledged. In this response, applicants have amended the title as suggested by the Examiner. In addition, claim 20 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter from claim 22, and claim 34 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter from

claim 38. Claims 22 and 38 have been canceled accordingly. Claims 20, 24, 26, 34 and 37 have been amended to correct informalities, and claims 27, 29, 39 and 40 have been amended to correct dependency. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

## II. Objection to Title Is Moot

The title was objected to for not being descriptive. The title has been replaced with the following title as suggested by the Examiner: “Method and System for Multi-Channel Data Transmission to a Plurality of Subscribers in a Bluetooth Network.” Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the title is now moot and should be withdrawn.

## III. Claim Objections Due to Informalities Are Now Moot

Claims 22, 24, 26, 34 and 37 were objected to because of informalities. In particular, claim 22 was objected to because the phrase “causing data exchange at during” should read “causing data exchange during.” Claim 22 has been cancelled, but the limitations of cancelled claim 22 have been incorporated into claim 20 with the phrase “causing data exchange during” as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 24 was objected to for lack of antecedent basis for the terms “the sniff mode” and “the park mode.” Claim 24 has been amended to change dependency from claim 20 to claim 21. Claim 21 includes antecedent basis for the terms “the sniff mode” and “the park mode.”

Claim 26 was objected to because the phrase “the time slot” should recite “the second

time slot.” Claim 26 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 34 was objected to because the phrase “causing data exchange at during” should read “causing data exchange during.” Claim 34 has been amended to recite “causing data exchange during” as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 37 was objected to because the phrase “according to one of claim 34” should read “according to claim 34.” Claim 37 has been amended to recited “according to claim 34” as suggested by the Examiner.

#### IV. Indefiniteness Rejection of Claims 39 and 40 Is Now Moot

Claims 39 and 40 were rejected as being indefinite because claims 39 and 40 originally depended from preliminarily canceled claim 16. Claims 39 and 40 have been amended to change dependency to claim 34.

#### V. Prior Art Rejections Are Now Moot

Claims 20, 21, 23-25, 28, 29 and 31-33, 34-37 were rejected as being obvious over the prior art. Claim 20 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter from cancelled claim 22. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 20, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Claims 21 and 23-33 each depend directly or indirectly from claim 20. Therefore, claims 21 and 23-33 are in condition for allowance as well.

Claim 34 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter from cancelled claim 38. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 34, as amended, is also in condition for allowance. Claims 35-37, 39 and 40 each depend directly or indirectly from claim 34.

Therefore, claims 35-37, 39 and 40 are in condition for allowance as well.

VI. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicant has made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 13-0014.

January 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



David R. Moorman  
Attorney for Applicants  
Attorney Registration No. 59,323  
Maginot Moore & Beck  
Chase Tower  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109  
Telephone: (317) 638-2922